

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00204 01 OF 02 120941Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00
ICAE-00 INRE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
/078 W

-----095433 120948Z /15

O R 120859Z APR 78
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2737
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0204

E O 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
SUBJ: MBFR: BRIEFING OF SOVIET REPS ON NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS

BEGIN SUMMARY: AS AGREED IN THE AD HOC GROUP SESSION OF
APRIL 10, US REP AND DEP REP CALLED ON SOVIET REP TARASOV AND
SOVIET DEP REP SHUSTOV ON APRIL 11 TO GIVE SOVIETS A PRE-BRIEF
ON WESTERN INITIATIVE. SOVIET QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
EMPHASIZED SOVIET DISSATISFACTION WITH COLLECTIVE NATURE OF
REDUCTION COMMITMENT BY WESTERN EUROPEANS AND CANADA. END
SUMMARY

1. US REP SAID, IN CONTINUATION OF THE USEFUL CUSTOM
WHICH BOTH SIDES HAD OBSERVED IN THE TALKS, HE HAD BEEN ASKED
TO GIVE SOVIET REPS A PREVIEW OF THE WESTERN PROPOSALS WHICH
WESTERN REPS WOULD GIVE IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF APRIL 12.
THIS INITIATIVE MADE SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES IN THE WESTERN
PROPOSALS AND DEALT DIRECTLY WITH MAJOR TOPICS WHICH EASTERN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00204 01 OF 02 120941Z

REPS HAD STRESSED.

2. US REP CONTINUED WITH SUMMARY OF WESTERN PROPOSALS.

3. FOLLOWING SUMMARY, US REP SAID:

4. WESTERN INTENTION IN ADVANCING THESE PROPOSALS WAS TO

GIVE A POLITICAL SIGNAL TO SOVIET AUTHORITIES THAT THE US AND ALL OTHER WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE STRONGLY INTERESTED IN MOVING INTO A DECISIVE PHASE IN THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS.

5. WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HOPE THAT SOVIET AUTHORITIES WOULD ALSO DECIDE ON THEIR RESPONSE FROM A WIDER POLITICAL VIEWPOINT AND THAT THEIR ANSWER WOULD BE SUCH THAT THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS COULD NOW MOVE INTO SUCH A DECISIVE PHASE.

6. WESTERN REPS CONSIDERED THAT THE INITIATIVE DEALT WITH MAJOR OPEN ISSUES OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT: (A) COMMITMENTS FROM THE WESTERN EUROPEANS AND (B) THE CONTENT OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS, INCLUDING ARMAMENTS.

7. THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS WERE DEPENDENT ON AGREEMENT ON DATA. PARTICIPANTS WERE NOW ENGAGED IN A DATA DISCUSSION WHICH, IF SUCCESSFUL, SHOULD DETERMINE THE OVERALL NUMBER OF REDUCTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY BOTH SIDES.

8. THUS, WITH GOOD WILL ON BOTH SIDES, THESE PROPOSALS COULD PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR A FIRST FORCE REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

9. DURING DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES ONE AND TWO FOR COMMITMENTS ON PHASE II REDUCTIONS, TARASOV INTERRUPTED TO ASK US REP WHETHER THE COMMITMENTS WOULD BE COLLECTIVE ONES OR INDIVIDUAL ONES. US REP REPLIED THEY WOULD BE COLLECTIVE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00204 01 OF 02 120941Z

AGAIN DURING BRIEFING, TARASOV ASKED WHETHER THE COLLECTIVE CEILING PROPOSAL WOULD COVER ALL PARTICIPANT STATES OR ALSO ENVISAGED A LIMITATION ON THE SOVIETS. US REP SAID IT WAS THE LATTER.

10. FOLLOWING THE BRIEFING, TARASOV MADE THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS: US REP HAD SAID ONE WESTERN CONDITION FOR THESE NEW PROPOSALS WAS EAST/WEST AGREEMENT ON DATA. BUT IN THE PROPOSAL ITSELF, US REP HAD PRESENTED THE WEST'S PREVIOUS SCHEME FOR 68,000 SOVIET REDUCTIONS AND 29,000 US REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I. HOW COULD THIS DEMAND BE MAINTAINED IN THE ABSENCE OF AGREEMENT ON DATA? WAS THIS FIGURE OF 68,000 SOVIET WITHDRAWALS ILLUSTRATIVE OR A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE? WOULD THE WEST INSIST ON THESE WITHDRAWALS NO MATTER WHAT THE DATA SHOWED?

11. US REP SAID THIS FIGURE WAS NOT ILLUSTRATIVE. IT HAD BEEN THE WESTERN PROPOSAL ALL ALONG.

12. TARASOV SAID THE WEST HAD COME TO THESE FIGURES ORIGINALLY ON THE BASIS OF ITS CALCULATION OF THE DISPARITIES BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN FIGURES IN THE AREA. THE WEST WAS NOW SAYING THAT THIS PROPOSAL SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED IF THERE WAS AGREEMENT ON FIGURES. HOWEVER, IT SEEMED TO HIM THAT THERE

WAS SOME INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THESE NEW PROPOSALS AND THIS
CONDITION. IF DATA WERE AGREED ON AND SHOWED FIGURES FOR
EASTERN MILITARY MANPOWER DIFFERENT FROM PRESENT WESTERN
ESTIMATES, WOULD WESTERN REDUCTION DEMANDS CHANGE OR WOULD THEY
REMAIN THE SAME?

13. US REP SAID WESTERN PARTICIPANTS CONTINUED TO
CONSIDER THAT THEIR DATA WAS CORRECT. SHUSTOV SAID, IN EFFECT,
US REP WAS SAYING THT, NO MATTER WHAT THE OUTCOME OF THE DATA
DISCUSSION WAS, THE REDUCTIONS ASKED OF THE SOVIETS WOULD
REMAIN AS THEY HAD ORIGINALLY BEEN STATED. US REP SAID THE
BASIC WESTERN PROPOSAL WAS THAT EACH SIDE SHOULD HAVE AN EQUAL
NUMBER OF MEN. TARASOV SAID, IF EAST AND WEST AGREED ON THE
DATA AND IT WAS FOUND THAT THE FORCES ON EACH WERE EQUAL AT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00204 01 OF 02 120941Z

PRESENT, WOULD THE WEST STILL ASK FOR THE SAME EASTERN
REDUCTIONS?

14. US REP SAID THIS WAS SUCH A THEORETICAL SITUATION THAT
WEST HAD NOT CONSIDERED IT.

15. TARASOV SAID IT WAS ALSO CLEAR FROM THESE PROPOSALS
THAT THE EAST WOULD NOT KNOW HOW MUCH EACH COUNTRY WOULD
REDUCE. THIS ISSUE WAS VERY IMPORTANT TO THE SOVIETS. WESTERN
PARTICIPANTS KNEW THAT THE SOVIETS HAD A VERY STRONG INTEREST
IN THIS ISSUE. FRANKLY SPEAKING, THIS NEW PROPOSAL DID NOT
MEET THE SOVIET PREOCCUPATION AS TO HOW MANY FORCES A CERTAIN
WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRY WOULD REDUCE. THE SOVIETS WOULD HAVE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00204 02 OF 02 120930Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00
ICAE-00 INRE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-10 IO-13 L-03
OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00
/078 W

-----095307 120947Z /15

O R 120859Z APR 78

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2738
SECDEF WASH DC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0204

TO SPECIFY THEIR REDUCTIONS, BUT THEY WOULD NOT KNOW THE
REDUCTIONS TO BE MADE BY THIS COUNTRY AND BY OTHER WESTERN
EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS.

16. TARASOV ASKED FROM WHAT POINT THE TIME PERIOD
WOULD START FOR PHASE II REDUCTIONS. US REP SAID FROM DATE OF
ENTRY INTO EFFECT OF PHASE I AGREEMENT. TARASOV SAID HE DID
SEE A SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE IN THE WESTERN POSITION ON TIMING.
THIS WAS AN IMPORTANT ASPECT. TARASOV SAID HE SAW NO TREATMENT
OF EUROPEAN ARMS REDUCTIONS IN THE WESTERN PROPOSALS. US REP
EXPLAINED WESTERN POINT THAT PHASE I COMMITMENTS ON ARMS
REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO COMMITMENTS ON
REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF SPECIFIED US NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND
SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS. TARASOV ASKED WHETHER IT WOULD BE
PRECLUDED TO RAISE ISSUE OF ARMS IN PHASE II. US REP SAID THIS
WOULD NOT BE PRECLUDED. TARASOV ASKED WHAT SOVIETS WERE
EXPECTED TO DO WITH ARMAMENTS OF WITHDRAWN SOVIET UNITS. US
REP EXPLAINED THAT DISPOSITION WAS UP TO SOVIET AUTHORITIES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00204 02 OF 02 120930Z

TARASOV ASKED IRONICALLY WHAT SOVIETS WERE EXPECTED TO DO WITH
THESE ARMAMENTS.

17. TARASOV ASKED FOR FURTHER EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE ONE AND ALTERNATIVE TWO AND US REP PROVIDED
EXPLANATION.

18. TARASOV THEN RETURNED TO THE THEME OF SPECIFYING
INDIVIDUAL FIGURES FOR WESTERN EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS. HE SAID
THAT, BEFORE PARTICIPANTS REDUCED FORCES, THERE SHOULD BE
AGREEMENT ON INDIVIDUAL FIGURES FOR REDUCTIONS. THE WESTERN
PROPOSALS DID NOT SPECIFY THESE FIGURES BUT ONLY PROVIDED FOR
OVERALL REDUCTIONS. WOULD THE WESTERN EUROPEANS REDUCE
PROPORTIONATELY TO THEIR FORCES? IF NOT, FOR EXAMPLE, SUCH
THINGS COULD HAPPEN AS LUXEMBOURG ABOLISHING ITS FORCES AND THE
FRG REDUCING ONLY ONE SOLDIER IN PHASE II.

19. SUMMING UP, TARASOV SAID THE SOVIETS WOULD CAREFULLY
STUDY THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS. THESE PROPOSALS WOULD PERMIT
THE EAST TO CONSIDER THEIR OWN MOVES. THE SOVIETS DID WISH TO

MOVE THE NEGOTIATIONS FORWARD. HE COULD SAY NOW, ON AN
INFORMAL BASIS, THAT MANY OF THE EAST'S CONCERNS WERE NOT MET
IN THE NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS AND EVEN THAT THE MOST SERIOUS OF
THE EAST'S INTERESTS HAD NOT BEEN MET. HOWEVER, THE PROPOSALS
DID PROVIDE FOOD FOR THOUGHT AND EASTERN REPS WOULD STUDY THEM
CAREFULLY.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FOREIGN COMMITMENTS, REGIONAL DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978MBFRV00204
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780157-0161
Format: TEL
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780463/aaaacbkv.tel
Line Count: 230
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 57053ab1-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2987606
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: BRIEFING OF SOVIET REPS ON NEW WESTERN PROPOSALS BEGIN SUMMARY: AS AGREED IN THE AD HOC GROUP SESSION OF APRIL 10, US REP AND DEP REP CALLED O N SOVIET REP
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/57053ab1-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014